

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 618-1185-999 8151 10/785,148 02/24/2004 Kenneth R. Cooper EXAMINER 20583 02/07/2005 JONES DAY WALCZAK, DAVID J **222 EAST 41ST ST** PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT NEW YORK, NY 10017 3751

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	11.]
Office Action Summary		10/785,148	COOPER ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
_		David J. Walczak	3751	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apported to the second section apported to the second section apport	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	••
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailined patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from b, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communic D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	eation.
Status				
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 J	anuary 2005.		
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.		
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠	Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.			
Applicati	on Papers			
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Examine	ır.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	` '	
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureau	s have been received. s have been received in Application rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	or the certified copies not receive	eu.	
Attachment		0 <u>-4</u> ,		
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da		
3) 🔲 Inforn	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date		atent Application (PTO-152)	

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification has not adequately defined how the textured nature of the outer surface inhibits the build up of dirt and grime, i.e., it would seem that a textured surface (as opposed to a smooth surface) would more readily permit the build up of dirt due to the increased amount of friction between the dirt and the surface, i.e., dirt particles could get wedged within the texture of the surface. Further, the Applicant has indicated that the outer surface may be textured or smooth but does not disclose how one surface is more beneficial than the other.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 and 4-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Izushima. In regard to claim 1, Izushima discloses an elastomeric gripping element 28 (see Figure 4) configured to fit over a gripping section of an article wherein the gripping element comprises a textured outer surface28a2 and a plurality of elevated sections 28a1 extending from the outer surface wherein the elevated sections are intercalated, spaced apart shapes. Further, in as much as the Applicant has disclosed how the textured surface will inhibit the build up of dirt and grime in the gaps between the shapes, the textured surface of Izushima will inherently act in the same manner, i.e., a dirt particle of the right size would be prevented from lodging (therefore prevent other particles from "building up") between the elevated sections 28a1 due to the protrusion (i.e., "texture") 28a2. In regard to claims 4-8, the element is formed from an anti-slip, resilient thermoplastic elastomer (column 3, lines 15-16) having the claimed hardness (column 3, lines 22-24). In regard to claim 9, the elevated sections are spaced such that "small" particles will not become lodged therebetween and a particle which is large enough to become lodged can be "readily" dislodged. In regard to claim 10, the elevated sections have a smooth surface.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2 and 3 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Izushima. In regard to claims 2 and 3, although the Izushima reference does not disclose the height of the elevated sections, the Examiner takes official notice that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the elevated sections can be designed to have any suitable height, including the claimed height, without effecting the overall operation of the device. Further, given the gripping element in the Izushima reference is for a writing instrument (as is the Applicant's), it appears that the claimed height of the elevated sections is well within the realm of obviousness to one of ordinary skill in the art. It is noted that since this rejection has not be seasonably challenged by the Applicant, the claimed feature is now considered to be admitted prior art, see MPEP 2144.03, section C.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/13/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant contends that the Izushima reference does not disclose an textured outer surface, it cannot disclose a textured outer surface which would prevent the built up of dirt or grime. As discussed supra, however, surface 28a2 is considered to be a textured surface and is inherently capable of operating as claimed.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 3751

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David J. Walczak whose telephone number is 571-272-4895. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs, 6:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Justine Yu can be reached on 571-272-4835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David J. Walczak Primary Examiner Art Unit 3751

DJW 2/5/05